

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated April 29, 2004.

Claim Objection

Claim 6 was objected to because the word "basecoat" should be inserted appropriately. Claim 6 has been accordingly amended and the Examiner's acceptance of the amendment and withdrawal of the objection in view thereof are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 in View of Lille

The Office Action rejected claims 3-4, 9-10, 13, 15-17, 19-20, 22-23 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lille, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,314. However, the Lille reference does not teach each element of independent claims 3, 9 or 19. In amended independent claim 3, the claimed air bearing slider comprises a composite slider body and a transducer basecoat portion. The composite slider body has a front portion composed of a first material and a rear portion composed of a second material different from the first material. The Office Action interprets the Lille reference as teaching a slider with a front portion 358 composed of a first material and a rear portion 354 composed of a second material different from the first material, with a transducer basecoat portion 352. However, the part designated by reference number 352 is not described anywhere in the Lille specification. A study of the specification as a whole reveals that silicon chip 354 is not a portion of a composite slider body as claimed, but rather is analogous to the claimed transducer basecoat portion.

The background section of the Lille specification teaches that a silicon chip provides circuitry for a magnetic head assembly. (Column 2, lines 1-12). The silicon chip of the Lille disclosure allows for precise removal of unwanted silicon to insure the silicon wafer thickness does not add to the length of the ABS or to the gram load of the slider. (Column 2, lines 28-33). With reference to FIG. 2, Lille describes that a silicon chip 204 is coupled to a slider body 214. (Column 5, lines 1-8). Thus, silicon chip 204 is distinct from slider body 214, and no part of silicon chip 204

forms a part of slider body 214. Similarly, in FIG. 3, silicon chip 354 does not form any part of slider body 358. (Column 5, lines 41-47). Similarly, in FIG. 5, silicon wafer 510 is bonded to slider body 512. (Column 6, lines 59-62). In each embodiment disclosed in the Lille reference, the slider body is formed of a single material and is attached to a transducer basecoat portion, which in the Lille disclosure is a silicon chip (see Column 5, lines 7-8: "a titanium carbide slider body 214, or alternatively on a silicon slider body"). The Lille reference does not teach a composite slider body with a front portion composed of a first material and a rear portion composed of a second material different from the first material, the composite slider body being attached to a transducer basecoat portion attached to the rear portion of the slider body and containing a transducer. Accordingly, independent claim 3 and its dependent claim 4 are not anticipated by Lille.

Independent claim 9 is also not anticipated by Lille. Because Lille does not teach a composite wafer comprising a first material and a second material different from the first material, it does not anticipate a method for forming such a composite wafer. Further, claim 9 recites a step of "forming on the layer of second material a transducer basecoat portion containing a transducer." The Lille reference teaches that a silicon wafer is first fabricated and then bonded to a slider body. (Column 6, lines 61-62; FIGS. 9-10). The Lille reference does not teach forming a transducer basecoat portion on a composite wafer. Because the Lille reference does not teach each step of the claimed method, independent claim 9 and its dependent claims 10, 13, and 15-17 are not anticipated thereby.

Independent claim 19 has been amended to recite a composite air bearing slider comprising a transducer, a composite slider body and a transducer basecoat portion. As discussed, the Lille reference does not teach such a composite slider body distinct from a transducer basecoat portion. Therefore, independent claim 19 and its dependent claims 20, 22-23 and 25-26 are not anticipated thereby.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-4, 9-10, 13, 15-17, 19-20, 22-23 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 in View of AAPA

The Office Action rejected claims 19-20 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA). Independent claim 19 has been amended to recite a composite air bearing slider comprising a composite slider body formed of different materials and a separate transducer basecoat portion. As amended, the AAPA does not disclose each element of the amended claim. Therefore, independent claim 19 and its dependent claims 20 and 23-26 are not anticipated by the AAPA and the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5-7, 11-12, 14, 18 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lille. As discussed above, the Lille reference discloses a slider body composed of only one material. The Lille reference does not teach or suggest a composite slider body as claimed in independent claim 3. Claims 5-7 depend from claim 3 and are allowable therewith. Claims 11-12, 14 and 18 depend from independent claim 9. As discussed above, the transducer basecoat portion of the Lille disclosure is formed separately and then attached to a ceramic wafer. There is no teaching or suggestion of a step of forming a transducer basecoat portion on the second material of a composite wafer, as recited in independent claim 9. Therefore, independent claim 9 and its dependent claims 11-12, 14 and 18 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claim 21 depends from amended independent claim 19. Claim 19 similarly includes the limitation of a composite slider body, which Lille does not teach or suggest. Therefore, dependent claim 21 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action indicated that claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 8 has been accordingly rewritten.

New claims 27-29 depend from claim 8. Notice of the allowance of claim 8 and its dependent claims 27-29 is respectfully requested.

New claims

Applicants hereby present new claims 30-35 for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are fully supported by the original specification, and no new matter is hereby added. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable in view of the prior art and request notice of the allowance of claims 30-35.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 3-35 are allowable and respectfully request notice to that effect. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this paper or credit any over payment to deposit account number 11-0982.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: July 29, 2004

By Mai-Tram D. Lauer
Mai-Tram D. Lauer, Reg No. 43,589
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580